United Nations A/72/805–S/2018/245

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
26 March 2018

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-second session
Agenda item 34 (a)
Prevention of armed conflict

Security Council
Seventy-third year

Letter dated 20 March 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith the address of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the parliaments of foreign States and parliamentary assemblies of international organizations regarding the condemnation of political repressions by the Russian Federation against citizens of Ukraine as a result of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine and regarding the release of political prisoners who are citizens of Ukraine (see annex).

I would appreciate your kind assistance in having the present letter and its annex distributed as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34 (a), and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Volodymyr **Yelchenko**
Ambassador,
Permanent Representative

18-04747 (E) 020418

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 20 March 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Address of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the Parliaments of Foreign States and Parliamentary Assemblies of International Organizations regarding the Condemnation of Political Repressions by the Russian Federation against Citizens of Ukraine as a Result of Armed Aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, and regarding the Release of Political Prisoners who are Citizens of Ukraine

Condemning in the strongest terms the ongoing armed aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine that commenced on 20 February 2014 and has resulted in illegal occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol and certain areas of Donetsk and Luhansk regions,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of any violations by the Russian occupation authorities of human rights and freedoms in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine,

Underscoring that the Russian Federation as the occupying power under The Hague Convention (IV) respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its Annex: Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 18 October 1907, the Geneva Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 and the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I) of 8 June 1977, bears full responsibility for violation of the rights of the civilian population in the occupied territory,

Taking into account the Resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly 71/205 "Situation of Human Rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the City of Sevastopol (Ukraine)" adopted on 19 December 2016 and 72/190 "Situation of Human Rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the City of Sevastopol, Ukraine" adopted on 19 December 2017, which record and condemn systemic violations of human rights perpetrated by the Russian occupation authorities, including extrajudicial executions, enforced disappearances, politically motivated persecutions, restriction of basic political freedoms of residents of Crimea, and demand the Russian Federation to fully comply with its obligations under international law as an occupying power, as well as the Order of the International Court of Justice of 19 April 2017 relating to provisional measures in case *Ukraine vs the Russian Federation* regarding the application of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 21 December 1965,

Taking into account numerous decisions and resolutions by international organizations and their parliamentary assemblies, including the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which condemn the violations by the Russian Federation of human rights and politically and ethnically motivated persecutions, and call on the occupying power to immediately release all the illegally detained persons,

The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine urges the parliaments of foreign states and parliamentary assemblies of international organizations as follows:

to condemn the actions by the Russian Federation aimed against territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine as such that contradict the universally accepted norms and principles of international law, to increase politico-diplomatic and sanction pressure on the occupying power until complete halting of its aggression and restoration of sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized state border;

to condemn the violation by the Russian occupation administration of basic human and citizen rights and freedoms in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, as well as in temporarily occupied territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, particularly the illegal, politically and ethnically motivated persecution of opponents of the occupation, including by way of illegal detention and conviction of civil activists under unfounded and/or fabricated criminal charges;

to use all the available international politico-diplomatic and sanction mechanisms towards the Russian Federation in order that it immediately release all the hostages captured as a result of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, as well as release the citizens of Ukraine illegally detained by the Russian Federation under unfounded and politically motivated charges, including Uzeir Abdullaiev, Teimur Abdullaiev, Rustem Abiltarov, Zevri Abseitov, Muslim Aliiev, Refat Alimov, Ernes Ametov, Kiazim Ametov, Marlen Asanov, Volodymyr Balukh, Enver Bekirov, Memet Belialov, Oleksiy Bessarabov, Rustem Vaitov, Valentyn Vyhivskyi, Pavlo Hryb, Bekir Dehermendzhi, Emil Dzhemadenov, Arsen Dzhepparov, Volodymyr Dudka, Ruslan Zeytullaiev, Server Zekiriaiev, Tymur Ibrahimov, Rustem Ismailov, Yevhen Karakashev, Mykola Karpiuk, Stanislav Klykh, Oleksandr Kolchenko, Andriy Kolomiyets, Oleksandr Kostenko, Emir-Usein Kuku, Serhiy Lytvinov, Enver Mamutov, Remzi Memetov, Emil Minasov, Yevhen Panov, Yuriy Primov, Ismail Ramazanov, Ferat Sayfullayev, Aider Saledinov, Seiran Saliiev, Oleh Sentsov, Mykola Syzonovych, Vadym Siruk, Oleksiy Stohniy, Roman Sushchenko, Ruslan Trubach, Asan Chapukh, Oleksiy Chyrniy, Hlib Shabliy, Mykola Shyptur, Dmytro Shtyblikov, Victor Shur as well as all the other illegally imprisoned and illegally detained citizens of Ukraine in the temporarily occupied territories of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol, certain areas of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, and in the territory of the Russian Federation;

to demand that the Russian Federation unconditionally fulfill the Order of the International Court of Justice of 19 April 2017 relating to provisional measures in case *Ukraine vs the Russian Federation* regarding the application of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 21 December 1965;

to demand that the Russian Federation provide unhindered access of international missions and human rights organizations to the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine in order to conduct constant monitoring of the situation with human rights;

to use all possible kinds of sanctions against the administrative officials of the state governmental bodies of the Russian Federation and the occupation administration of the Russian Federation involved in the prosecution of the political prisoners who are citizens of Ukraine.

United Nations A/72/806–S/2018/252

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
28 March 2018
English
Original: Russian

General Assembly
Seventy-second session
Agenda item 99 (l)
General and complete disarmament: implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction

Security Council
Seventy-third year

Letter dated 21 March 2018 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith an aide-memoire from the Russian Federation with an explanation of the real situation concerning the Skripal case (see annex).

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 99 (l), and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) V. **Nebenzia**

18-04952 (E) 050418 100418

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 21 March 2018 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Aide-memoire explaining the real situation concerning the Skripal case

1. On 12 March 2018, the British Prime Minister, Theresa May, speaking before the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, declared that it was "highly likely" that the Russian Federation was responsible for the poisoning on 4 March 2018 in Salisbury of Sergei Skripal, a former colonel in the Main Intelligence Directorate of the Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation and a double agent, and Yulia Skripal, his daughter, using the nerve agent designated by the British as A-234.

The United Kingdom has publicly alleged that Russia is concealing part of its chemical weapons arsenal and has made use of it, thus implying that Russia has violated its commitments under the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Chemical Weapons Convention) — one of the most effective multilateral treaties in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, which Russia has supported from the outset.

In making this allegation, the United Kingdom has taken aim not only at Russia, but also at the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and all the tremendous work carried out under its watch, including with the participation of the United Kingdom, over the past two decades.

The Russian Federation has submitted a full declaration of its chemical weapons stockpile as required under article III of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This information was thoroughly checked and verified by teams of inspectors from the OPCW Technical Secretariat. In its capacity as the competent international authority, OPCW has officially confirmed that the Russian chemical weapons stockpile has been completely destroyed.

2. In the face of such grave accusations, the Russian Embassy in London sent the Foreign Office a note verbale on 12 March 2018 requesting access to the materials used in the investigation, including samples of the chemical substance identified by the British investigators, so that these could be examined by experts as part of a joint investigation.

In so doing, we had proposed acting in accordance with article IX, paragraph 2, of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which stipulates that States parties to the Convention should resolve, through an exchange of information and bilateral consultations, any matter which may cause doubt about compliance with this international agreement. In accordance with article IX, Russia would have been prepared to respond to a request from the United Kingdom within a period of 10 days.

It is regrettable that, rather than adhering to existing international legal norms, the British have instead chosen to unscrupulously politicize the matter.

3. The British Prime Minister requested that a special meeting of the United Nations Security Council be held on 14 March 2018 to discuss the situation. Anticipating foul play, Russia insisted on keeping the Security Council meeting open.

It is unclear what the British were trying to achieve by involving the Security Council, which has no mandate with respect to this matter. It is clear, however, that until OPCW issues its conclusions and an assessment of the Salisbury incident —

including whether a nerve agent was indeed used and, if it was, how the potential source of the chemicals was identified, what measures were taken to assist the victims and on what grounds — there is simply no point discussing the matter.

4. On 14 March 2018, the British Prime Minister, having apparently come to her senses somewhat, sent a letter to Ahmet Üzümcü, Director-General of the OPCW Technical Secretariat, who circulated it to the member States of the OPCW Executive Council on 15 March 2018, in which she invited the Technical Secretariat to conduct an independent review of the British investigation of the Salisbury incident.

According to the Foreign Office press release dated 18 March 2018, further to the Prime Minister's letter, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to OPCW invited the experts of the OPCW Technical Secretariat to come to the United Kingdom and conduct an independent review of the conclusions reached by the British laboratory at Porton Down regarding the Salisbury incident. The experts arrived in the United Kingdom on 19 March 2018.

Russia is looking forward to an official, detailed report by OPCW on all aspects of the Skripal case. We expect the OPCW Technical Secretariat to conduct a comprehensive, independent investigation that complies with all the relevant provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

5. Russia has a growing list of questions concerning both legal and practical matters. We will be persistent in seeking answers to these questions through OPCW.

For the record, Russia did not use a chemical weapon against the United Kingdom. The attack on the Skripals using toxic chemicals should be considered an act of terrorism. Since a Russian citizen, Yulia Skripal, was among the victims, we are requesting that the British cooperate with us in accordance with article IX of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We are seeking answers to the following questions:

Where and how were samples collected from Sergei and Yulia Skripal and by whom? How was this documented? Who can certify the reliability of the collected data? Did the procedures to collect evidence comply with all OPCW chain of custody requirements?

Did the British use spectrum analysis or other methods to figure out so quickly that the chemical agent — Novichok as it is designated in the West — was allegedly used? It is our understanding that, to do this, they would have needed to have a standard sample of the agent on hand.

How can this rush to judgment be reconciled with official statements by Scotland Yard indicating that it would need weeks, if not months, to issue its findings?

What information and signs of illness prompted the decision to administer antidotes to the victims — the Skripals and the British policeman? Could this not have caused severe complications and the subsequent deterioration of their condition?

Which specific antidotes were used? What tests justified the use of these drugs?

How can the delayed effect of the nerve agent be explained, given its generally immediate effect? It was said that the victims were poisoned at a pizzeria (or else in a car, at the airport or at home, according to other information). So, what really happened? How did they end up on a park bench an unknown amount of time later?

We need an explanation for the baseless accusations specifically implicating Russia in the Skripal case, when the United Kingdom, the United States, Sweden and Czechia also worked on the development of Novichok, as it is known in the West. The results of their efforts to create new toxic agents of this type were published in more

than 200 open sources in countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

6. Even in purely human terms, London's actions are nothing short of barbaric. On 4 March 2018, according to the version given by the British authorities themselves, toxic agents were used in an attack against a Russian citizen, Yulia Skripal, on British soil.

The Russian Federation is demanding that comprehensive information be provided on the progress made in the investigation of the Salisbury incident involving this Russian citizen (a note verbale to that effect was sent by the Russian Embassy in London on 12 March 2018).

The United Kingdom is violating the basic tenets of international relations by continuing to deny Russian consular officials access to Ms. Skripal, as required under the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, without explanation. For more than two weeks we have been unable to reliably ascertain what happened to our citizen and her actual condition at present.

The Russian Investigative Committee office for high-profile cases opened a criminal investigation on 16 March 2018 into the attempted premeditated murder of Yulia Skripal, a citizen of the Russian Federation, and the endangerment of the general public on British soil.

The investigation will be conducted in accordance with Russian and international law. Investigators plan to involve highly qualified experts in the investigation.

The investigators stand ready to work together with the British authorities. We look forward to the cooperation of British authorities.

7. In its statements delivered to the United Nations Security Council, OPCW and all other international forums, the Russian Federation has consistently and insistently called for all crimes involving the use of toxic agents to be thoroughly, fully and professionally investigated and for the guilty parties to be held accountable.

We are ready to cooperate fully and transparently with the United Kingdom to dispel any concerns in a bilateral format, through OPCW and within the framework of other international instruments, and to act in accordance with international law.

Russia, as a responsible member of the international community and a conscientious party to the Chemical Weapons Convention, will never use the language of ultimatums or respond to unofficial oral questions.

The actions of Western countries in the Skripal case, which they themselves have fabricated, fly in the face of the rules of international law, customary international law and plain common sense. Naturally, we are keeping a careful record of all this. When the time comes, the guilty parties will be brought to justice.

United Nations A/72/807–S/2018/236

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
26 March 2018

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-second session
Agenda item 35
Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

Security Council
Seventy-third year

Identical letters dated 19 March 2018 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia on the holding of the presidential elections of the Russian Federation in Georgia's occupied territories, dated 18 March 2018 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex issued as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 35, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Elene **Agladze**
Chargé d'affaires
Deputy Permanent Representative

18-04757 (E) 020418

Please recycle

Annex to the identical letters dated 19 March 2018 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia on holding the Presidential Elections of the Russian Federation in Georgia's occupied territories

18.03.2018 — The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia condemns holding the Presidential Elections of the Russian Federation in the occupied territories of Georgia on 18 March 2018, where 33 polling stations were illegally opened. This is a clear demonstration of the ongoing occupation of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali regions and represents yet another step towards their factual annexation by the Russian Federation.

The Russian Federation holds its parliamentary and presidential elections in Georgia's occupied territories in the circumstances, when the population remained in Abkhazia and Tskhinvali regions have been subject of illegal and forceful mass passportization implemented by Moscow since 2000s, and hundreds of thousands of IDPs and refugees expelled from those regions as a result of ethnic cleansing are still deprived of the right to return to their homes.

With such actions the Russian Federation fully disregards the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, and blatantly violates the fundamental norms and principles of international law, such as sovereignty and territorial integrity, inviolability of internationally recognized borders and non-interference in the internal affairs of another state.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia appeals to the international community to give a due assessment to the illegal actions of the Russian Federation in the occupied regions of Georgia that undermine the international law and rules-based international order.

United Nations A/72/808–S/2018/233

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
2 April 2018

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-second session
Agenda item 34 (a)
Prevention of armed conflict

Security Council
Seventy-third year

Letter dated 16 March 2018 from the Permanent Representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation and Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

We have the honour to bring to your attention the joint statement on Syria by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey (Astana, 16 March 2018).[1]

We should be grateful if you would circulate the present letter as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34 (a), and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Gholamali **Khoshroo**
Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran

Vassily **Nebenzia**
Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation

Feridun H. **Sinirlioğlu**
Permanent Representative of Turkey

[1] The text of the joint statement is available at: www.mid.ru/en/diverse/-/asset_publisher/zw12FuDbhJx9/content/sovmestnoe-zaavlenie-ministrov-inostrannyh-del-islamskoj-respubliki-iran-rossijskoj-federacii-i-tureckoj-respubliki-po-sirii-astana-16-marta-2018-goda?_101_INSTANCE_zw12FuDbhJx9_redirect=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mid.ru%2Fen%2Fdiverse%3Fp_p_id%3D101_INSTANCE_zw12FuDbhJx9%26p_p_life.

18-05091 (E) 050418

Please recycle

United Nations A/72/809

General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 April 2018

Original: English

Seventy-second session
Agenda item 142
Joint Inspection Unit

Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to draw the attention of the members of the General Assembly to the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness", which is available under the symbol JIU/REP/2017/6.

18-05022 (E) 100418

Please recycle

United Nations A/72/809/Add.1

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 March 2018

Original: English

Seventy-second session
Agenda item 142
Joint Inspection Unit

Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the members of the General Assembly his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness" (see A/72/809).

18-04954 (E) 130418

Please recycle

Summary

In its report entitled "Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness" (see A/72/809), the Joint Inspection Unit examined the progress made in the implementation of results-based management practices, building on the previous reports on the same topic issued in 2004 and 2012. The report is based on data collected in 2015 and early 2016 and focuses on the results-based management policy element as defined in General Assembly resolutions 67/226 and 71/243 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.

The present note reflects the views of organizations of the United Nations system on the recommendations provided in the report. The views have been consolidated on the basis of inputs provided by member organizations of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, which welcomed the report and supported some of its conclusions.

I. Introduction

1. In its report entitled "Results-based management in the United Nations development system: analysis of progress and policy effectiveness" (see A/72/809), the Joint Inspection Unit addressed the conceptual and technical challenges of results-based management, as well as their underlying causes, and the structural, systemic and political constraints on the implementation of results-based management. Some of the constraints have already been the subject of debate in the United Nations system, leading to the adoption of new resolutions on governance in the 2016 review cycle and to the Secretary-General's reforms in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In its review, the Unit takes a cross-cutting, system-wide view with the aim of helping the United Nations system to further enhance the relevance and value of its results-based management system in support of the 2030 Agenda.

II. General comments

2. The organizations of the United Nations system commend the Joint Inspection Unit for having produced a comprehensive report on results-based management in the United Nations development system and recognize the benefits of working coherently and being accountable for results, while taking measures to increase outward engagement and coherence with stakeholders outside the United Nations system and various implementation partners, in order to contribute effectively to broader efforts at the country level.

3. The organizations recognize that the most compelling findings presented in the report are those that detail the challenges and constraints of system-wide operations and of meeting the demands of results-based management, even though some organizations are not entirely convinced of the link between those findings and the recommendations.

4. The organizations further recognize that results-based management is at different implementation stages in the different organizations of the United Nations system and that the nature of support and guidance required by each organization may be different.

5. The organizations note the benefits of aligning the report with the broader United Nations system-wide instruments for measuring, monitoring and reporting on results, as outlined in the report of the Secretary General entitled "Repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda: our promise for dignity, prosperity and peace on a healthy planet" (A/72/684-E/2018/7) and its annex.

III. Specific comments on recommendations

Recommendation 1

Executive heads who have not already done so should develop a well-defined, comprehensive and holistic strategy to guide the mainstreaming of results-based management within and across organizations.

6. The organizations generally support this recommendation, although some note that, while it is difficult to dispute the potential benefits of organizations' adopting a strong results-based management strategy, it is not apparent from the report that the existence of a strategy is, in and of itself, transformative. As noted in the report, only one entity was found to have such a strategy, therefore making it difficult to ascertain

that having such a strategy is critical to results-based management. Similarly, it is worth noting that the existence of a strategy (in accordance with the recommendation) does not necessarily lead to the allocation of resources or capacity or provide the institutional will to implement the strategy.

7. The organizations also note that this recommendation may be particularly relevant for those organizations that are at the beginning of their maturity curve in terms of the implementation of results-based management. For organizations that are more advanced in this regard, the implementation of the recommendation would involve "retrofitting" only.

8. In the case of the United Nations Secretariat, results-based management is considered essential to changing the focus of the Organization from processes and activities to outputs and results and to holding senior management and staff at all levels accountable for their delivery, as outlined by the Secretary-General in his report entitled "Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations: ensuring a better future for all" (A/72/492) and in the seventh progress report on the accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat, which is being prepared for consideration by the General Assembly during the second resumed part of its seventy-second session.

Recommendation 2

Executive heads, including the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chair of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB), should consider establishing a backbone support function to ensure that the vast range of innovations introduced in results-based management across the United Nations system are captured, supported, assessed for value and shared for adoption system-wide.

9. The organizations are partially supportive of this recommendation, notwithstanding the fact that results-based management is at different implementation stages across the United Nations system and that entities therefore have different needs.

10. The organizations also note that informal networks already exist in which good practices on results-based management experiences are shared system-wide (e.g. through the United Nations strategic planning network). Furthermore, the organizations underscore their preference for retaining a certain level of discretion in developing and maintaining unique systems and tools for results-based management that are best suited to the operating contexts and capacities of the individual entities.

Recommendation 3

Executive heads should strengthen the development of the culture of results by including in their respective capacity development agenda a focus on enhancing the mindset and value systems that are important for enhancing staff commitment and engagement in implementing results-based management.

11. The organizations support this recommendation and note the well-established role of leadership in fostering a culture of results-based management within an organization. They also recognize that fostering senior-level leadership is fundamental to the successful implementation of results-based management.

12. For this purpose, the Secretary-General is proposing, in the action plan on results-based management to be included in the seventh progress report on the accountability system in the United Nations Secretariat, a high-level advocacy and outreach campaign to promote results-based management and to incorporate in the senior managers' compacts a performance indicator assessing the contribution of

senior managers to the implementation of results-based management. The Secretary-General is also proposing to create a link between the performance assessments of senior managers and staff at all levels and organizational performance with the aim of effectively promoting a culture of results across the United Nations Secretariat.

Recommendation 4

Executive heads should ensure that the future development of approaches to staff accountability and human resources management incorporate more consideration of managing for achieving results, including the development of incentive systems that promote both accountability for results and accountability for transformative learning and innovations at all levels.

13. The organizations support this recommendation. Some organizations, namely the United Nations Secretariat, the World Health Organization and the World Tourism Organization, reported ongoing plans to strengthen individual accountability for results and to link them to the achievement of the objectives and results of the organizations.

Recommendation 5

Executive heads should make the use of information on results, including evidence resulting from evaluations, a strategic priority.

14. The organizations support this recommendation. In the case of the United Nations Secretariat, the Secretary-General views the ability of the Secretariat to conduct proper self-evaluations and to actively include lessons learned in the programme planning and budgeting process of the Organization as essential elements for the implementation of results-based management.

Recommendation 6

Legislative bodies may wish to work with heads of organizations to enhance the focus on managing for results beyond the demand for accountability and reporting to give a greater focus on what works, what does not work and why, and do so with due regard to context.

15. The organizations generally support this recommendation, noting the importance of considering any changes in the role of legislative bodies, taking into account the specificity and diversity of governance arrangements across the system with regard to this kind of oversight and the critical feedback provided by programme countries in determining "what works".

Recommendation 7

The Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, should request inter-agency bodies working on accountability reforms to conceptualize and develop a collective accountability framework that is fit for collective impact, as required for results-based management and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

16. The organizations generally support the objective of this recommendation, although they underscore how their respective governing bodies weigh priorities differently, as well as the priority of each of the components in their accountability frameworks. While the United Nations system can advance common practices of internal controls (e.g. the recent adoption of the three lines of defence model by CEB)[1] and/or a common process and procedures, the organizations recognize that it would

[1] See www.unsceb.org/content/action-risk-management-oversight-accountability-model.

seem more logical for United Nations entities, and not the Secretary-General as Chair of CEB, to develop accountability frameworks that are fit for collective impact, especially at the country level, in the context of the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks. The accountability frameworks should collectively and individually measure their contributions to the 2030 Agenda in line with the actual targets and indicators adopted by Member States and by using country systems to track their progress to the extent possible. The organizations further note that accountability frameworks vary considerably, depending on their subject, that they should be tailored to specific circumstances and that, therefore, there cannot be one model for all.

United Nations A/72/810

General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 March 2018

Original: English

Seventy-second session
Agenda item 142

Joint Inspection Unit

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Felipe **García Landa** (Mexico)

I. Introduction

1. At its 2nd plenary meeting, on 15 September 2017, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided to include in the agenda of its seventy-second session the item entitled "Joint Inspection Unit" and to allocate it to the Fifth Committee.

2. The Fifth Committee considered the item at its 30th and 34th meetings, on 14 and 29 March 2018. Statements and observations made in the course of the Committee's consideration of the item are reflected in the relevant summary records.[1]

3. For its consideration of the item, the Committee had before it the following documents:

(a) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2017 and programme of work for 2018 (A/72/34);

(b) Note by the Secretary-General on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2017 (A/72/733);

(c) Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Outcome of the review of the follow-up to the Joint Inspection Unit reports and recommendations by the United Nations system organizations" (A/72/704);

(d) Note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Outcome of the review of the follow-up to the Joint Inspection Unit reports and recommendations by the United Nations system organizations" (A/72/704/Add.1).

[1] A/C.5/72/SR.30 and A/C.5/72/SR.34.

18-05036 (E) 030418

Please recycle

II. Consideration of draft resolution A/C.5/72/L.26

4. At its 34th meeting, on 29 March, the Committee had before it a draft resolution entitled "Joint Inspection Unit" (A/C.5/72/L.26), submitted by the Chair of the Committee on the basis of informal consultations coordinated by the representative of Japan.

5. At the same meeting, the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/72/L.26 without a vote (see para. 6).

III. Recommendation of the Fifth Committee

6. The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

Joint Inspection Unit

The General Assembly,

Recalling its previous resolutions on the Joint Inspection Unit, in particular resolutions 31/192 of 22 December 1976, 50/233 of 7 June 1996, 54/16 of 29 October 1999, 56/245 of 24 December 2001, 57/284 A and B of 20 December 2002, 58/286 of 8 April 2004, 59/267 of 23 December 2004, 60/258 of 8 May 2006, 61/238 of 22 December 2006, 61/260 of 4 April 2007, 62/226 of 22 December 2007, 62/246 of 3 April 2008, 64/262 of 29 March 2010, 65/270 of 4 April 2011, 66/259 of 9 April 2012, 67/256 of 12 April 2013, 68/266 of 9 April 2014, 69/275 of 2 April 2015, 70/257 of 1 April 2016 and 71/281 of 6 April 2017,

Reaffirming the statute of the Unit[1] and the unique role of the Unit as the only external and independent system-wide inspection, evaluation and investigation body,

I
Report of the Joint Inspection Unit

Having considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2017 and programme of work for 2018[2] and the note by the Secretary-General on the report of the Unit for 2017,[3]

1. *Takes note with appreciation* of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2017 and programme of work for 2018;[2]

2. *Takes note* of the note by the Secretary-General on the report of the Unit for 2017;[3]

3. *Reiterates its request* to the executive heads of the participating organizations to comply fully with the statutory procedures for consideration of the reports of the Unit and, in particular, to submit their comments, including information on what they intend to do regarding the recommendations of the Unit, to distribute reports in time for their consideration by legislative organs and to provide information on the steps to be taken to implement those recommendations accepted by the legislative organs and the executive heads of participating organizations;

4. *Reiterates its request* to the Secretary-General and the other executive heads of the participating organizations to fully assist the Unit with the timely provision of all information requested by it;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General and invites the executive heads of organizations participating in the Unit, to take the necessary measures to ensure that the thematic reports of the Unit are listed under the appropriate substantive agenda items of the work programmes of the General Assembly, other pertinent organs and bodies of the United Nations and the appropriate legislative organs of the other participating organizations;

6. *Stresses* the importance of the oversight functions of the Unit in identifying concrete managerial, administrative and programming questions within

[1] Resolution 31/192, annex.
[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventy-second Session, Supplement No. 34* (A/72/34).
[3] A/72/733.

the participating organizations and providing the General Assembly and other legislative organs of participating organizations with practical and action-oriented recommendations to improve and strengthen the governance of the United Nations as a whole;

7. *Reaffirms* article 20 of the statute of the Unit,[1] in which it is stipulated that the Unit shall be invited to be represented at meetings when its budget estimates are being discussed;

8. *Recognizes* that the effectiveness of the Unit system-wide is a shared responsibility of the Unit, the Member States and the secretariats of the participating organizations;

9. *Also recognizes* the need to continue to enhance the impact of the Unit on the management efficiency and transparency of the participating organizations within the United Nations system;

10. *Reiterates* its request to the Unit to consider optimizing the number of projects in its programme of work through prioritization;

11. *Also reiterates* its request to the Unit to continue to focus its reports on priority items of the participating organizations and the States Members of the United Nations, including by taking into consideration the programme of work of the General Assembly, with the aim of providing the Assembly and other legislative organs of participating organizations with thematic reports of the Unit that can be used to maximum effect;

12. *Welcomes* the coordination of the Unit with the Board of Auditors and the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the Secretariat, and encourages those bodies to continue to share experiences, knowledge, best practices and lessons learned with other United Nations audit and oversight bodies, as well as with the Independent Audit Advisory Committee, with a view to avoiding overlap or duplication and achieving further synergy, cooperation, effectiveness and efficiency, without prejudice to the respective mandates of the audit and oversight bodies;

13. *Also welcomes* the completion of the migration of the web-based tracking system and the website of the Unit to platforms hosted by the United Nations Secretariat, and requests the heads of participating organizations to make full use of the web-based tracking system of the Unit;

II

Outcome of the review of the follow-up to the Joint Inspection Unit reports and recommendations by the United Nations system organizations

Having considered the notes by the Secretary-General[4] drawing to the attention of the General Assembly the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Outcome of the review of the follow-up to the Joint Inspection Unit reports and recommendations by the United Nations system organizations"[5] and his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon,[6]

1. *Takes note* of the notes by the Secretary-General;[4,6]

2. *Invites* the Joint Inspection Unit to continue to provide an in-depth analysis of how the recommendations of the Unit are being implemented;

[4] A/72/704.
[5] JIU/REP/2017/5.
[6] A/72/704/Add.1.

3. *Encourages* the heads of participating organizations to examine possible options for improving coordinated action, including through the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, in response to relevant recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit;

4. *Reiterates* its invitation to the legislative organs of the participating organizations to fully consider, discuss and take concrete action in a timely manner on the relevant recommendations issued by the Unit, including follow-up, as appropriate, taking into account the provisions of paragraph 4 of its resolution 50/233;

5. *Requests* the executive heads of the participating organizations who have not yet done so to establish a direct reporting line from the Joint Inspection Unit focal points to top management.

United Nations A/72/811

General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 March 2018

Original: English

Seventy-second session
Agenda items 127 and 136

Global health and foreign policy

Programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019

Scope, modalities, format and organization of the high-level meeting on the fight against tuberculosis

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/72/L.40

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Felipe **García Landa** (Mexico)

1. At its 33rd and 34th meetings, on 27 and 29 March 2018, the Fifth Committee, pursuant to rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, considered the statement submitted by the Secretary-General on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/72/L.40 (A/C.5/72/22) and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/72/7/Add.46). The statements and comments made in the course of the Fifth Committee's consideration of this question are reflected in the relevant summary records.[1]

2. At its 34th meeting, the Committee had before it a draft decision submitted by the Chair of the Committee on the basis of informal consultations coordinated by the representative of Saudi Arabia (A/C.5/72/L.27). At the same meeting, the Committee adopted draft decision A/C.5/72/L.27 without a vote (see para. 3).

Decision of the Fifth Committee

3. The Fifth Committee, having considered the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General[2] and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,[3] decides to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/72/L.40, resources amounting to $49,800 would be required under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, and $9,900 under

[1] A/C.5/72/SR.33 and A/C.5/72/SR.34.
[2] A/C.5/72/22.
[3] A/72/7/Add.46.

Please recycle

section 28, Public information, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019. Efforts will be made to absorb the estimated additional requirements of $59,700 within the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019, and the additional expenditures will be reported in the relevant performance report for the same biennium.